DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 343 364 EC 301 050

AUTHOR Ysseldyke, James E.; Lange, Cheryl M.
TITLE Participation of Different Categories of Students with Special Needs in Enrollment Options. Research Report No. 4. Enrollment Options for Students with Disabilities.
INSTITUTION Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis.
SPONS AGENCY Special Education Programs (ED/OSERS), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Jan 92
CONTRACT H023C0004
NOTE 33p.; For related documents, see EC 301 047-049.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; Agency Cooperation; *Behavior Disorders; *Disabilities; Elementary Secondary Education; *Emotional Disturbances; Open Enrollment; School Administration; *School Choice; School Districts; State Programs; State Surveys; *Transfer Policy; Tuition Grants
IDENTIFIERS *Minnesota

ABSTRACT

A random sample of Minnesota school districts participated in a study that examined the participation rates of students with disabilities in school choice options and tuition agreements. Surveys were sent to 100 Directors of Special Education; the response rate was 74%. The Directors of Special Education were asked to document the number of students with disabilities transferring in or out of their districts by means of open enrollment, high school graduation incentives (HSGI), tuition agreements between boards, and any other enrollment option. A large majority of students with disabilities were found to be transferring school districts using tuition agreements. Students demonstrating emotional/behavioral disorder were found to be the largest disability group (31 percent) transferring schools and utilizing both open enrollment and tuition agreements between boards. The greatest number of students (73 percent) were transferring schools using tuition agreements between boards. Very few participants used the HSGI option to transfer schools. Significant differences were found in participation rates between districts of differing enrollments with districts having enrollments over 20,000 also having the greatest percentage of students transferring in. Possible reasons for the high numbers of students with emotional and behavior disorders are discussed. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED343364

Participation of Different Categories of Students with Special Needs in Enrollment Options

Research Report No. 4

Enrollment Options for Students with Disabilities

James E. Ysseldyke and Cheryl M. Lange

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

January , 1992

EC 301050

 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Research Report No. 4

Participation of Different Categories of Students with Special Needs in Enrollment Options

James E. Ysseldyke and Cheryl M. Lange
University of Minnesota

Enrollment Options for Students with Disabilities

University of Minnesota

January, 1992

Abstract

A random sample of Minnesota school districts were chosen to participate in a study that examined the participation rates of students with disabilities in school choice options and tuition agreements. Surveys were sent to 100 Directors of Special Education who were asked to document the number of students with disabilities transferring in or out of their districts by means of Open Enrollment, High School Graduation Incentives, tuition agreements between boards and any other enrollment option. A large majority of students with disabilities were found to be transferring school districts using tuition agreements. Students demonstrating emotional/behavioral disorder were found to be the largest disability group transferring schools. And significant differences were found in participation rates between districts of differing enrollments.

This project was supported by Grant No. H023C0004 from the Office of Special Education Programs, U.S. Department of Education. The views expressed are those of the authors, and not necessarily of the funding agency.

Participation of Different Categories of Students with Special Needs in Enrollment Options

Across the country public school choice is being touted as one of the major school reforms of the '90's. In America 2000, President Bush declares that "New incentives will be provided to states and localities to adopt comprehensive choice policies...." (p.12). Already over 25 states have passed or proposed school choice legislation (Education Commission of the States, 1989). These school choice programs vary from access to postsecondary classes for high school students, to intradistrict choice plans, to the more dramatic plans which call for opportunities to enroll in non-resident school districts.

The impact public school choice plans will have on school reform has yet to be ascertained. What is known is that school choice plans are being offered in many states, that the plans vary according to the kind of legislation that has been passed, and that some parents are using enrollment options to choose another school or program for the education of their children.

Much has been written about the expected outcomes of giving parents the right to choose their child's school. Proponents such as Chubb and Moe (1990) contend that school choice will result in the competition necessary to elevate the achievement of the nation's school children. Raywid (1989) has reviewed some of the early school choice programs and finds reason for optimism in that the attitudes of students participating in schools of choice are more positive as is the involvement of parents in their children's schooling. Nathan (1989) described some of the expected outcomes

when he said, "While public school choice programs will not solve all of our school problems, well-designed plans can help provide the freedom educators seek, the expanded opportunities many students need; and the dynamism the public education system requires" (p. 32). While it will be some time before a complete evaluation of school choice and its impact on education will be known, it is time to begin to try and understand how this school reform is affecting the students in America's schools.

Though public school choice is being evaluated and reviewed, in almost all cases what is written is generalized to the at-large school population. Hardly ever is the effect of school choice on students with disabilities discussed or even mentioned. Yet, students in special education comprise a rather large segment of the school population with needs and services that are probably the most well-defined of any student group in the schools. It is important, therefore, that the effects of school choice on students with disabilities also be studied to determine how this school reform will impact special education and the students it serves.

Before we can understand the effects of school choice on students with disabilities it is important to know the extent to which they are accessing the various options available to them. Once participation has been established, many more questions can be formed about the impact of "choice" on students with disabilities.

Minnesota has been a leader in school choice legislation and implementation. The state passed some of the first school choice

legislation and has enacted some of the most comprehensive legislation to date. Minnesota's experiences with public school choice offer an excellent opportunity for the study of enrollment options and their effects on students with disabilities. The state's early commitment to school choice reform provides opportunities to study who is accessing the options and the effects on the education of students with disabilities.

Since 1985 Minnesota has passed legislation which has produced several innovative public school choice options. Seven key enrollment options are the foundation of Minnesota's school choice program (Minnesota Department of Education). The options are listed and defined in Table 1. These include a postsecondary option which allows juniors and seniors to apply to take courses at postsecondary institutions while still in high school. There are four enrollment options aimed at at-risk students: High School Graduation Incentives (HSGI), Pregnant Minor/ Minor Parents Program, Area Learning Centers, and Alternative Schools. These options give students who have dropped out of school or whose achievement is considerably below grade level an opportunity to enroll in a school outside of their resident school district or to enroll in an alternative school or learning center specifically designed to meet the needs of at-risk students. Another option, Open Enrollment, allows students to apply for enrollment into any school district in the state. Only a lack of space or an imbalance in desegregation enrollment can prohibit transfer. The newest option, Charter Schools, gives parents, educators, and

students the opportunity to develop a school independent of the school district, without the loss of state funding.

While many enrollment options are available to Minnesota's students, it should be noted that students, especially those with disabilities, have been transferring between school districts for some time. School boards often have decided that certain students needs would be better met in another district. While parents have had some input into these decisions, often the action has been precipitated by the school districts. These transfers, called tuition agreements between school boards, are still occurring and by including them in the study of enrollment options, hopefully, more insight can be gained into school choice and the transfer of students with disabilities.

Minnesota's extensive school choice opportunities allow study of the participation of students in enrollment options. In this paper, we address three research questions about school choice and the participation of students with disabilities.

1. To what extent are students with disabilities participating in enrollment options or tuition transfers?
2. To what extent is participation a function of type of disability?
3. To what extent is participation a function of district size?

Table 1

Minnesota Enrollment Options Programs

Learners in Minnesota have several enrollment option programs which allow them to choose the school or education program they wish to attend.

Postsecondary Enrollment Options program	Provides 11th and 12th grade students, who qualify for the postsecondary institution of their choice, the opportunity to take college courses for high school credit. The program gives the student choice of a wider variety or more advanced courses than may be available in their high school.
Open Enrollment Program	Allows students kindergarten through 12th grade the opportunity to apply to attend a school outside the district in which they live. Applications are due in the non-resident district before January 1, except for those choosing to enter or leave districts with desegregation plans.
High School Graduation Incentives Program	Designed for students who are not likely to graduate or who have dropped out of school before getting their diplomas. These learners may choose from a variety of education options to complete the requirements needed to graduate.
Area Learning Centers	Offer personalized education programs, year round, day and evening, to accommodate the needs of learners. A wide variety of courses, leading to diplomas, are taught using alternative methods of instruction. Additional services are provided to assure each learner's success. Learners aged 12 through adult may attend.
Public or Private Alternative Programs	Personalize the education of learners at risk of not completing high school. Classes are taught using alternative methods and flexible scheduling. These programs are offered during the typical school day and year.
Education Programs for Pregnant Minors and Minor Parents	Designed to encourage parenting and pregnant teens to continue their education and receive their high school diplomas. A variety of education options are available. Child care and transportation may be arranged.
Charter Schools	Educationally, financially, and legally independent from a school district. They can be started by licensed teachers who get permission from the State Board of Education and their local school board. They are run by an independent elected board of directors.

Source: Minnesota Department of Education.

Method

To ascertain the number of pre-school through 12th grade students with disabilities who were participating in the various enrollment options in Minnesota, two surveys were designed and distributed to a random sample of the 433 school districts in the state.

Using enrollment figures available from the Minnesota Department of Education, a sample of 100 districts was stratified according to total district enrollment and the percentage of students receiving special education services. In Table 2 we outline the enrollment totals and special education percentages per district that were used for sampling purposes.

We asked the Directors of Special Education in each of the districts to complete two surveys. In the first survey they were to identify the number of non-resident students with disabilities or students in gifted or English as a Second Language (ESL) programs who were being served by special education in their District as of December 1, 1990 (chosen as it is the federal child count date). The students could have transferred into the district by means of Open Enrollment, High School Graduation Incentives, a tuition agreement between school boards or any other type of enrollment option.

In the second survey the Directors were asked to determine the number of resident students with disabilities or special needs who had left their district during the 1990-91 school year due to the same enrollment options programs.

Table 2

Stratified Sample of Minnesota School Districts by Total District Enrollment and Percentage of Students in Special Education

	Total District Enrollment					
Percent of Students in Special Education	≤300	300-999	1,000-2,499	2,500-9,999	10,000-19,999	20,000+
Less than 5%	0	0	0	0	0	0
5-9%	8%	13%	11%	5%	<1%	0
10-14%	10%	26%	8%	7%	1%	<1%
15-19%	2%	4%	<1%	0	0	0
Greater than 20%	<1%	<1%	0	0	0	0
Total Districts	21%	44%	20%	12%	2%	1%

In both surveys transferring students were to be identified by handicapping condition or gifted or ESL designation. An enclosure accompanied the surveys defining each of the enrollment options available in Minnesota. The survey and the definitional enclosure are found in Appendix A.

Results

The Directors of Special Education were most helpful in providing the participation data as 74% of the school districts returned the surveys. And, the number of districts returning the surveys were representative of the random sample.

Review of the data revealed a problem with the reported number of participants in the High School Graduation Incentive (HSGI) option. Very few participants were identified as using the HSGI option to transfer schools. This was contrary to what we had learned from talking with Directors of Special Education. They had indicated a much higher number of students using the HSGI option. The difficult nature of gathering data about HSGI participants is understandable since these students often do not enter under any formal application process and may have dropped out of the resident school prior to attending an HSGI program. The Directors are often not aware of those students with special education needs who have left their district for HSGI programs. In addition, HSGI students are likely to attend Alternative School programs or Area Learning Centers and are included in their student count. Consequently, the data gathered for this option were not included in the analysis of these surveys and an

alternate survey was used to gather more in-depth information about their participation (Gorney & Ysseldyke, 1992).

Participation in Options

In Table 3 we list the percent of resident and non-resident students with disabilities who were participating in each of the remaining options: tuition transfer, Open Enrollment, and other. By far, the greatest percentage of non-resident students with disabilities were transferring schools using tuition agreements between boards (73%). Open Enrollment transfers accounted for 16% of the non-resident students with disabilities who transferred and 12% were reported transferring under the "other" category.

As expected, resident students with disabilities were also reported as transferring schools in large percentages (76%) due to tuition agreements between school boards. Only four percent of the transfers of resident students were reported due to Open Enrollment. The "other" category accounted for 20% of the transfers.

It should be kept in mind that since a random sample of districts provided participation data, not every sending or receiving district's counterpart was surveyed. Thus, the percentages of students using the various options for the residents and non-residents do not match. We will use the non-resident data for further analysis. When the non-resident data are compared to the information provided by the Minnesota Department of Education, they appear to be the most similar.

The "other" category comprised a large percentage of students transferring schools. The respondents had been asked to specify

Table 3

Students with Disabilities Transferring by Tuition Agreements, Open Enrollment, and "Other"

	Non-residents	Residents
Tuition Agreements	73%	75%
Open Enrollments	16%	4%
Other	12%	21%

their reasons for reporting students in the "other" category. A review of the reasons indicates the majority of these students were transferring by means of interdistrict cooperative agreements. These differ from tuition agreements in that tuition agreements are usually made on an individual basis. School staff, parents and students can have input into the tuition transfer decision. However, in the case of interdistrict agreements, usually an entire grade level or several grade levels are being educated in a neighboring district. This is especially true in the rural areas where some districts are paired; one school district may provide the education for kindergarten through 6th graders and a neighboring district is responsible for 7th through 12th grade education. Even though these students are being served in a school district other than the one in which they reside, "choice" is not the reason for their transfer.

A few of those students identified as participants under the "other" category were students who were attending a program center for a school district involved in a cooperative where special education services have been consolidated or were attending a day treatment center whose services were in a neighboring district. And, a small number were in programs where there were shared services between school districts, programs for 11th and 12th graders who were accessing special education beyond their traditional 11th and 12th grade years (a 13th year), or the students were in non-resident districts because of foster care arrangements or court placement programs.

When the "other" group is removed from the transfer options, the proportions of non-resident students transferring due to tuition agreements and Open Enrollment change. Eighty-two percent of the transfers that involve some level of choice by either a district, parent, or student are by tuition agreements and 18% are transferring by means of Open Enrollment.

Participation by Disability or Special Need

In Table 4 we report the percentage of non-resident students in each of the disability categories and gifted and ESL programs who transferred into the surveyed schools by means of tuition agreements or Open Enrollment. Students with emotional/behavioral disorder accounted for the largest group of students with disabilities who transferred into these school districts (31%). Eighteen percent of the non-resident participants were listed as students with mental retardation, 13% of the non-residents were reported as students with learning disabilities and 12% were reported as hard of hearing or deaf.. All other disability categories were reported in percentages of 8% or less.

To facilitate analysis and aid in data interpretation, the disability groups were combined into groups of high, medium, or low prevalence in special education as specified by Ysseldyke and Algozzine, (1990). Those students reported as receiving speech or learning disabilities services were considered to be in the high prevalence group and those with emotional/behavior disorder and mental retardation were considered to be in the medium prevalence group. All other disability categories were considered to be in

Table 4

Percent of Non-resident Students with Disabilities Transferring by Disability Category and Type of Transfer

	Tuition Transfers (%)	Open Enrollment (%)	Total Transfers (%)
Autism	0	0	0
Early Childhood Special Education	5	0	5
Emotional and Behavioral Disorders	27	4	31
Hard of Hearing and Deaf	11	1	12
Learning Disability	5	8	13
Mental Retardation	16	2	18
Multiple Handicaps	8	0	8
Other Health Impaired	1	0	1
Orthopedic Handicap	4	0	4
Speech	3	3	6
Visual Impairment	0	0	0
English as a Second Language (ESL)	0	0	0
Gifted	0	0	0
Other	1	0	1

the low prevalence group. In Table 5 we list the disability groups and their national prevalence.

Chi square tests were conducted to determine if there were significant differences in transfer between students in the high, medium, and low prevalence groups and the prevalence groups in the special education population in Minnesota. Significant differences were found ($p < .0001$). A closer look at the crosstabs reveals considerably fewer students from the high prevalence group transferring than what would be expected given Minnesota's special education distribution. There were greater than expected numbers of students transferring in the medium and low prevalence groups.

To determine if there were significant differences between the two types of transfer (Open Enrollment and tuition transfer) in each of the disability prevalence groups, another chi square test was performed. Significant differences were found between the types of transfer. When reviewing the crosstabs, the high prevalence group did not appear to differ greatly between the two types of transfer. However, large differences were noted in both the medium and low prevalence groups with both groups using tuition agreements more than Open Enrollment.

Participation by District Size

Chi square tests were performed to determine if significant differences could be found in the use of enrollment options between different sized districts. Significant differences were found ($p < .05$) in the use of tuition agreements, Open Enrollment,

Table 5

National Prevalence of Disability Conditions

	National Prevalence of Students Receiving Special Education Services	Percentage of Students with Disabilities
High Prevalence Conditions		
Learning Disabilities	2 million	50.1
Gifted	1.6 million[a]	--
Speech	1 million	23.7
Moderate Prevalence Conditions		
Mental Retardation	507,331	12.5
Emotional/Behavioral Disorder	374,730	9.1
Low Prevalence Condition		
Multiple Handicap	67,500	1.7
Other Health Impairment	49,233	1.2
Orthopedic Handicap	41,864	1.0
Hard of Hearing and Deaf	41,003	1.0
Visual Impairment	17,357	0.4
Deaf and Blind	813	0.0

Note: From Thirteenth Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Office of Special EducationPrograms, U.S. Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, 1991.

[a]From Introduction to Special Education (2nd Ed.) by J. E. Ysseldyke and B. Algozzine, 1990, Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

and the use of both options between districts of varying enrollments.

A closer look at the frequency data revealed districts with enrollments over 20,000 having the greatest percentage of students with disabilities transferring (45%) into their districts. This was a considerably higher proportion than would be expected given the enrollment of the districts. Districts with enrollments over 20,000 comprise only 26% of the total enrollment (both students with and without disabilities) of surveyed districts. In Table 6 we report the percentage of non-resident students with disabilities transferring into each of the six enrollment groupings and how the transfers compare with the total enrollment of these districts.

When the frequency of transfer is analyzed according to district size and disability category there is considerable variability. To facilitate analysis we again placed the students in high, medium, and low prevalence disability categories. In Table 7 we report the percentages of students with disabilities in high, medium, and low prevalence categories within each enrollment grouping.

Except for those districts with the largest and the smallest enrollments, there seems to be an inordinately high percentage of transfers occurring in the medium prevalence group which includes students demonstrating emotional or behavioral disorders or mental retardation.

In Table 8 we take a closer look at the students from the medium prevalence group and the size of the districts to which

Table 6

Transfers of Non-resident Students with Disabilities by District Size

Enrollment	Non-resident Students with Disabilities Transferring into Districts (%)	Total Students in Surveyed Districts (%)
<300	1	2
300-999	10	16
1,000-2,499	11	14
2,500-9,999	24	22
10,000-19,999	8	19
>20,000	45	26

Table 7

Percentage of Students with Disabilities in High, Medium, and Low Prevalence Groups by District Size

	Disability Prevalence		
Enrollment	Low (%)	Medium (%)	High (%)
<300	0	25	76
300-999	24	43	32
1,000-2,499	10	80	9
2,500-9,999	5	63	32
10,000-19,999	57	41	2
>20,000	50	36	14

they are transferring. There is considerable transfer of students in EBD programs occurring in the medium size districts (1,000 to 9,999) and the largest district (over 20,000). There is little variance of transfer for students with mental retardation in small to medium sized districts. However, a much larger percentage of students with mental retardation are transferring into districts with 10,000 to 19,999 students and a much smaller percentage transferring into the largest district with the converse occurring for the EBD population.

Discussion

We investigated the extent to which students with disabilities participate in Open Enrollment and tuition agreements. And, we were especially concerned with the patterns of option use as a function of disability category and district location. We learned that students with disabilities do enroll in schools outside their district of residence. Most do so by means of between-district tuition agreements. Yet, 18% of students with disabilities who transfer school districts do so using Open Enrollment.

There is differential participation in Open Enrollment as a function of disability category and location. While the majority of students who are exceptional are learning disabled, gifted or have speech and language disorders, the majority of those who transfer schools are students who demonstrate emotional or behavioral disorders. And, transfers of these students are more

Table 8

Percentage of Students Transferring in Medium Prevalence Group by District Size

Enrollment	Students with Emotional Behavior Disorder (%)	Students with Mental Retardation (%)
<300	--	25
300-999	17	26
1,000-2,499	51	29
2,500-9,999	37	26
10,000-19,999	4	37
>20,000	31	5

prevalent into districts with total enrollments of 1,000 to 10,000 students or districts with enrollments over 20,000.

The prevalence of students with emotional or behavioral disorders in transfer programs is also reported by Gorney and Ysseldyke (1992) in a report of a survey that tracked students with disabilities participating in High School Graduation Incentives programs. Since the survey we used in this study did not give an accurate account of students with disabilities in HSGI programs, another survey was designed and sent to Alternative Schools and Area Learning Centers in the state of Minnesota. The results of the survey revealed an overwhelming use of HSGI programs by students with disabilities within the emotional or behavioral disorder category (54% of participants with disabilities).

The high incidence of students demonstrating emotional or behavioral disorders in the choice and transfer programs raises questions about how these students are being placed in their special education programs and whether the least restrictive environment is being sought. Especially alarming is the high percentage of students involved in tuition transfers who are considered students with emotional or behavioral disorders. Since tuition transfers involve agreements between boards and are not, as such, school choice options, there is concern that these transfers may be used to place "undesirable kids" out of their home districts.

Further study is required to ascertain the reasons these students are transferring in inordinately high numbers. Possible

explanations include the absence of programs to serve these students in smaller districts and the need for level 5 placements that may not be available in some school districts. It should be noted, however, that the data used in this report is for non-residents with disabilities being served in a particular district. Even those districts that might be considered smaller districts were receiving high percentages of students with emotional behavioral disorders. Except for the smallest districts (under 300) and the medium to large districts (10,000-19,999), the others were reporting high percentages of students from outside their district transferring into their EBD programs.

Candid discussions with some Directors of Special Education have illustrated the lack of desirability these students have for a school district. They are often the students that no one wants; teachers do not want to deal with the disruptive behaviors that may be exhibited and administrators do not want to fund the programs that require extensive staffing for few students. Thus, further study should be attempted to determine the reason for the high incidence of this disability category in tuition transfers.

While there is less variance between disability groups participating in Open Enrollment, students being served in EBD programs still are participating in proportions greater than that of the state EBD population. Again, a question is raised about why there are proportionately more students transferring using the school choice option, Open Enrollment, than what would be expected from state enrollment data. Are these students being encouraged to leave their districts? Have their programs been unsuccessful,

thus, inadvertently giving encouragement to being educated elsewhere?

The high percentage of HSGI students with emotional or behavioral disorders is also noteworthy. The HSGI programs are geared toward those students who are having difficulty in school, either academically or behaviorally. This may explain, to some extent, why there is such a high percentage of HSGI students with disabilities identified as having emotional or behavioral disorders. However, this percentage of students is so much greater than the Minnesota special education population identified as being served in EBD programs (15%) that the LRE question is again raised. How are these students being served in special education and what encouragement or discouragement are they getting to access different transfer or choice programs?

Although we were quite careful to randomly select the districts to be surveyed and took into account the size of the districts and the percentage of students with disabilities being served in the chosen districts, there are some limitations to the study that should be noted. Larger districts had a more difficult time identifying special education students who transferred. Often the transfer data were available, but the school personnel had a difficult time determining if these students were being served by special education. Thus, there may be some under-reporting of participants, especially in the large districts.

It is encouraging that students with disabilities are participating in one of the newest school reforms, school choice. Those who are involved in special education are always mindful of

students with disabilities inclusion in activities and changes in the schools. However, in this study we have illustrated how students with disabilities are still transferring, by and large, in the traditional manner of tuition agreements between school boards. While this may be an acceptable way for students needs to be met, the hope is that with more school choice options available to all students, that those with disabilities will have equal access to these school choice programs, thus, providing them with more control over their educational future than is the case with tuition transfers.

Students with emotional or behavioral disorders are transferring through tuition agreements and accessing Open Enrollment and other enrollment options more than students with other disabilities. Administrators and policy-makers need to explore alternative explanations for this finding.

References

American 2000: An Education Strategy (Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Education, 1991).

Chubb, J. E., & Moe, T. N. (1990). Politics, markets, and America's schools. Washington, DC: Brookings Institute.

Education Commission of the States (1989b). Survey of state initiatives: Public school choice. Denver, CO: Author.

Gorney, D. J., & Ysseldyke, J. E. (1992). Students with disabilities use of various options to access alternative schools and area learning centers (Research Report No. 3). University of Minnesota: Enrollment Options for Students with Disabilities Project.

Minnesota Department of Education (1989). Minnesota enrollment options programs. St. Paul, MN: State of Minnesota Department of Education Enrollment Options Services

Nathan, J. (1989). Public schools by choice. Minneapolis, MN: Free Spirit Publishing Co.

Raywid, M. A. (1989). The case for public schools of choice (Fastback No. 283). Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Ysseldyke, J. E., & Algozzine, B. (1990). Introduction to special education (2nd ed.). Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Appendix A

District Survey and Enclosure

ENROLLMENT OPTIONS FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES STUDY

District _____ Contact Person _____ Phone No. _____

Please complete the following grid by indicating the number of **NON-RESIDENT** students with disabilities or special needs your district was serving on December 1, 1990 under each of the enrollment options. Count a student only once. Please note the definitions on the accompanying pink enclosure.

NON-RESIDENT STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES/SPECIAL NEEDS BEING SERVED

	High School Graduation Incentive	Tuition Student	Open Enrollment	OTHER (Specify)	TOTAL
Autism					
Early Childhood Sp. Ed.					
Emotional & Behavioral Disorder					
Hearing Impaired					
Learning Disability					
Mental Retardation					
Multiple Handicaps					
Other Health Impaired					
Physical Handicap					
Speech					
Visual Handicap					
English as a Second Language (ESL)					
Gifted					
Other (Specify on back)					
TOTAL					

IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS PLEASE CALL CHERYL LANGE AT 612-624-5832. PLEASE RETURN IN THE ENCLOSED ENVELOPE BY MAY 1, 1991. THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION.

District: _____

Please complete the following grid by indicating the number of **RESIDENT** students with disabilities or special needs that have left your district during the 1990-91 school year under one of the following enrollment option programs. Please count a student only once.

RESIDENT STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES/SPECIAL NEEDS WHO LEAVE DISTRICT

	High School Graduation Incentive	Tuition Student	Open Enrollment	OTHER (Specify)	TOTAL
Autism					
Early Childhood Sp. Ed.					
Emotional & Behavioral Disorder					
Hearing Impaired					
Learning Disability					
Mental Retardation					
Multiple Handicaps					
Other Health Impaired					
Physical Handicap					
Speech					
Visual Handicap					
English as a Second Language (ESL)					
Gifted					
Other (Specify on back)					
TOTAL					

IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS PLEASE CALL CHERYL LANGE AT 612-624-5832. PLEASE RETURN IN THE ENCLOSED ENVELOPE BY MAY 1, 1991. THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION.

University of Minnesota Enrollment Options Survey

Please use the following definitions and descriptions when completing the attached grids.

Resident: Any student who lives within district boundaries.
Non-resident: Any student who lives outside of the district boundaries.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

Open Enrollment: Include those **SPECIAL EDUCATION** kindergarten through 12th grade students who have applied for open enrollment through the state's Open Enrollment Program and are now participating in the option. The student must have applied before January 1, 1990 except if choosing to enter or leave districts with desegregation plans.

High School Graduation Incentives (HSGI): Include those **SPECIAL EDUCATION** students who have chosen to enter or leave your district through the HSGI program. They must be at-risk for dropping out of school or have already dropped out of school and are now returning. They may choose a variety of programs. These include any public high school, any non-profit, nonpublic, nonsectarian school that has contracted with the school district of residence, an approved public alternative education program, or an Area Learning Center.

The students you identify as HSGI students must qualify for HSGI by having at least one of the following characteristics:

- At least two grades below performance in local achievement tests
- At least one year behind in graduation credits
- Pregnant or a parent
- Assessed as chemically dependent
- Been excluded or expelled
- Been referred by a school district

Tuition Students: Include those **SPECIAL EDUCATION** students who leave or enter your district by special tuition agreements. Include in this group all **SPECIAL EDUCATION** students who leave or enter to attend residential treatment facilities, chemical dependency programs, and other schools or programs under agreements between school boards or tuition agreements.

Other: Include any students you have served or do serve in **SPECIAL EDUCATION** who are in programs not listed above. These may include students who are home-schooled, or have informal agreements between boards or are in other types of programs of which we are not aware. Please specify the programs on the back of the surveys.

COOPERATIVES: We understand some special education programs are only available at one school district within a cooperative (e.g. some level 4 and 5 programs). If you have students who attend another district because it is the only place the program is offered in the cooperative, please count the students under the OTHER category and specify the reason.

HANDICAPPING CONDITIONS

Include students who are being served by special education and either currently have an IEP or who had an IEP prior to transferring from your district. Classifications used for child count or current program placement may be used when considering handicapping condition.